



COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Rico Sonderegger
Serial No.: 10/088,977
Filed: March 26, 2002
Title: ANTIGLARE DEVICE
Docket No.: FRR-13072

8/10/02
J. Step two
2002
RECEIVED
JUL 26 2002
TC 2800 MAIL ROOM
Aft Unit: 2800
Confirmation No.: 6622

LETTER

Asst. Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Enclosed herewith is an English translation of the International Preliminary
Examination Report for filing in the above-identified application.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By


David E. Spaw, Reg. No. 34732

700 Huntington Building
925 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1405
(216) 566-9700
Customer No. 007609

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope
addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C.
20231 on the date indicated below.


Signature of Person Mailing Paper

7/19/02

Date

David E. Spaw

Printed Name of Person Mailing Paper

Translation
JUL 21 2002
PCT
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

RECEIVED
JUL 26 2002
TC-280 MAIL ROOM

Applicant's or agent's file reference P1605 PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IEPEA/416)
International application No. PCT/CH00/00497	International filing date (day/month/year) 15 September 2000 (15.09.00)	Priority date (day/month/year) 29 September 1999 (29.09.99)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC A61F 9/06, H05K 9/00		
Applicant OPTREL AG		

RECEIVED
SEP 18 2002
PCT/CH00/00497

- This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.
- This REPORT consists of a total of 9 sheets, including this cover sheet.
☒ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).
These annexes consist of a total of 1 sheets.
- This report contains indications relating to the following items:
 - ☒ Basis of the report
 - ☐ Priority
 - ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - ☒ Lack of unity of invention
 - ☒ Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - ☐ Certain documents cited
 - ☒ Certain defects in the international application
 - ☐ Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 07 April 2001 (07.04.01)	Date of completion of this report 04 December 2001 (04.12.2001)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

Form PCT/IEPEA/409 (cover sheet) (July 1998)

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/CH00/00497

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
pages _____ 1-8 _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims:
pages _____ 2-14 _____, as originally filed
pages _____, as amended (together with any statement under Article 19
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____ 1 _____, filed with the letter of _____ 19 November 2001 (19.11.2001)
- ☒ the drawings:
pages _____ 1/3-3/3 _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig. _____

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rule 70.16 and 70.17).

** Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/CH00/00497

IV. Lack of unity of invention

1. In response to the invitation to restrict or pay additional fees the applicant has:

- ☐ restricted the claims.
☐ paid additional fees.
☐ paid additional fees under protest.
☐ neither restricted nor paid additional fees.

2. ☒ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees.

3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is

- ☐ complied with.
☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

See supplemental sheet

4. Consequently, the following parts of the international application were the subject of international preliminary examination in establishing this report:

- ☒ all parts.
☐ the parts relating to claims Nos. _____

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/CH00/00497

VII. Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

See supplemental sheet

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

Internat. application No.
PCT/CH 0000497

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: IV. 3



RECEIVED
JUL 26 2002
TC-2800 MAIL ROOM

1. In the opinion of the Examining Authority the application fails to meet the requirement of unity of invention of PCT Rule 13.1 because the following claimed inventions are not linked by a single general inventive concept:

I) Claims 1-10

These claims define an antiglare device wherein

- 1) a screen element serves at least in part to screen the evaluation circuit against disruptive electromagnetic interference.

According to page 3, paragraph 1, of the description the object of feature 1) is to better protect the evaluation circuit against the disruptive effect of electromagnetic radiation.

II) Claims 11-14

These claims further define as claimed invention a screen element wherein

- 1) the screen element comprises electrically conducting material and
- 2) is concave in shape.

The aim of feature 1) above is to screen against electromagnetic radiation. Features 1) and 2) are

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/CH 00/00497

Supplemental Box
(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: IV. 3

known from the prior art (e.g. conventional
metallic screening covers).

The different inventions share **no special technical
features**. The requirement of unity of invention is
therefore not fulfilled within the meaning of PCT
Rule 13.2.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

Internat'l application No.

PCT/CH 00/00497

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to the inventive step or industrial applicability of the claims and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Claims

1-10

YES

Claims

11-14

NO

Inventive step (IS)

Claims

1-14

YES

Claims

1-14

NO

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims

1-14

YES

Claims

NO

2. Citations and explanations

This report makes reference to the following documents:

- D1: WO-A-98/14040 (RUUTTU JARI: TOERNROOS FILIP (FI)), 2 April 1998 (1998-04-02)
- D2: US-A-5 751 258 (FERGASON JOHN D ET AL), 12 May 1998 (1998-05-12).

1. Claims 1-10:

1. The present application fails to meet the requirement of PCT Article 33(3) because **the subject matter of Claim 1 does not appear to involve an inventive step.**

The closest prior art with respect to the subject matter of Claim 1 of the present application is discussed by the applicant on pages 1 and 2 of the description. It comprises, among other items, anti-glare devices as per the preamble of Claim 1.

The anti-glare device as per Claim 1 **differs from the above** in a screen element (4) which serves to

screen the evaluation circuit (31) or a part thereof against disruptive electromagnetic interference emitted by the control circuit.

As explained by the applicant himself on page 2 of the description, it is common practice in the prior art to electromagnetically screen evaluation circuits, which as a rule are sensitive to electromagnetic interference signals (page 2, lines 1-7) against the outside (page 2, lines 12 and 13). The applicant lists electric motors, power inverters of welding units, mobile telephones, etc., as known, common sources of interference signals (page 2, paragraph 1).

It is **common general knowledge** in the art that high-amplification and hence sensitive evaluation circuits or individual, sensitive parts thereof, irrespective of their application, are normally electromagnetically screened against the output signals of electronic sensors. A 360-degree screening of the sensitive circuit components against electromagnetic interference, as specified above, is **often necessary and a matter of routine**. This is indicated, for example, in **document D1** (see page 1, lines 14-22).

For many years even ordinary motor vehicles, for example, have been containing a wide range of electronic sensors (acceleration sensors for deploying airbags and stabilizing handling, temperature and pressure sensors in the engine compartment, etc.), each of the evaluation circuits in said sensors being screened against interference signals (transmitted by the engine, mobile

telephones, etc.) so as to ensure electromagnetic compatibility and the proper functioning of each unit.

Document D1 (page 1, line 19) further discloses that the sensitive circuits have to be screened against electromagnetic radiation emitted outside the apparatus or **by other parts of the apparatus.**

Control circuits of LCD-based anti-glare masks contain, among other things, an oscillator part (see, for example, D2, column 11, lines 44-67) which is known to produce electromagnetic interference signals. This is known to a person skilled in the art. It would therefore be obvious to screen the sensitive evaluation component of the total circuit against the control part, generating electromagnetic interference, of the total circuit. Similar configurations can be found in any computer (internally screened mains unit) or radio, in which circuit components sensitive to interference are electromagnetically screened against interference-generating circuit components of a total circuit.

The above is common general knowledge in the art, such that even if the disclosures of D1 and D2 are not combined Claims 1-10 still do not appear to involve an inventive step.

- 1.2 **Dependent Claims 2-10** appear not to contain any **additional features** which, combined with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements for inventive step. The reasons are as follows: